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Linguistic forms borrowed from one language by another are a source of information about the nature of the contacts between the peoples speaking the two languages: the origin of the speakers of the donor language, the amount and degree of bilingualism that existed, the purposes for which the donor language was used, and the status of the two languages vis-à-vis one another. Just as, for example, the English borrowings from medieval French alone are enough to tell us the character and nature of the contact and the purposes for which French was used in English society, so can borrowings among Southeast Asian languages provide clues as to the nature of the contact between different speech communities. For the English and French contact we have a large body of documents which independently bear out what we may deduce from the linguistic evidence alone. In Southeast Asia, however, where documentation is sparse, linguistic evidence may often be the best source of information. Here we shall look at Malay and Tagalog and see what we may deduce about the nature of Malay-Tagalog contacts. Tagalog is the only Philippine language outside of the Mindanao-Sulu area which shows appreciable Malay influence, and a study of the Malay borrowings, as we shall see, is highly revealing.

The documentary evidence for Malay in the Philippines is slender. Antonio Pigafetta, the chronicler of Magellan’s voyage around the world, which was the first European expedition to visit the Philippines, reports that the members of the expedition communicated with the Filipinos.
through an interpreter (until he escaped), a Sumatran-born slave brought from Spain. There is no question that Malay was the language used. In describing the negotiations with the king of Cebu, Pigafetta even quotes a sentence in Malay that he alleges was uttered. Further, the Cebuano-language word list, which Pigafetta took down on Limasawa Island, in a few cases gives Malay words or Malay synonyms for a Cebuano word. It may be possible to find evidence for Malay in the Philppines from other sources, but it is clear that our best evidence is going to be the forms themselves.

Our first task is to isolate borrowings: Malay and Tagalog are both Austronesian languages—that is, they are related, deriving from the same proto-language. Therefore, it is necessary to distinguish forms which are cognate by virtue of inheritance from those which are cognate by virtue of having entered one (or both) of the languages after they became different languages. Also, if we are to study these forms for clues to the nature of the contact between Malay and Tagalog, we must show that the borrowings are indeed from Malay and not from a third donor language.

We may quickly dispose of the possibility that the Malay forms in Tagalog came in through a third language. Most of the Tagalog forms of Malay provenience are not found in other Philippine languages north of Mindanao, and Tagalog was not in contact with Mindanao languages until this generation, so the possibility that the Malay forms came into Tagalog through another Philippine language may be ruled out. Also we may rule out the possibility that the borrowings came into Tagalog from Javanese, even though a good portion of the borrowings from Malay into Tagalog also have Javanese cognates; for the Tagalog form always follows the Malay shape when the Malay and Javanese forms have different shapes: for example, we say that Tagalog batas ‘law’ is borrowed from Malay batas ‘boundary’ and not Javanese wates ‘boundary’, because of its shape.  

3. “Theerupon the Mano merchant said to the king [of Cebu] Cuta mar shita.” [Pigafetta 1933: 153]. This is still normal Malay and means, “Our king has spoken.”

4. They are: cree bagus batas (Cebuano badis, Malay keres); ‘large’ bussel (not a Cebuano word, Malay boses) ‘drink’ minosahal (Malay minum; cabul unidentified); ‘cat’ meam (Malay makan); Fish (mapa guida, Malay idan, Cebuano idan); ‘all the same’ simavagama (Malay samasama). There are some other Malay forms in the list which probably were loan words in Cebuano. One can account for the existence of these Malay forms: natives often use a third language of wider communication when they attempt to speak to outsiders who do not know their language, whether or not the outsider speaks it. When I was eliciting forms in the Mountain Province of Luzon, natives often gave Cebuano forms instead of their own or in addition to their own. This appearance of Malay words in Pigafetta’s list is clear evidence that Malay was a language of wider communication in this part of the Philippines at that time.

5. There are long Tagalog forms of Sanskrit provenience for which I have found no cognates in Javanese or Malay, but since only a portion of the Javanese and Malay forms which exist are recorded in our dictionaries, there is no reason to suppose that these forms did not also occur in Javanese and Malay. Also, the presence of a form in our Javanese sources but not in Malay is without significance. The documentation of Malay dialects is very poor. We may presume that these Javanese forms were in use in whatever dialect of Malay influenced Tagalog. There is no evidence for direct influence of Javanese on Tagalog. All the evidence indicates that the Javanese influence on Tagalog came via Malay.

In the case of Tagalog-Malay cognates which originated in a third language, it is necessary to separate those which came into Tagalog via Malay and those which were borrowed independently in both Malay and Tagalog. For forms originating in the modern European languages it is usually clear enough that they were borrowed independently. The things that the forms refer to, their sound patterns, and the history of the forms in the European languages from which they come, all preclude the possibility that they could have come into Tagalog from Malay or vice versa. Thus, we need not consider pairs like Malay këresa Tagalog katuk ‘cart’; Malay këmeja Tagalog kamis ‘shirt’, and the like: the Malay forms were borrowed from Portuguese and the Tagalog from Spanish, quite independently of one another. For forms of Chinese provenience we assume that they were borrowed independently unless there is evidence of parallel development in shape or meaning, developments of a sort which could not easily have taken place independently. Thus, the pair Tagalog kauä and Malay kauah ‘cauldron’ seem to be borrowings from Mandarin kau [kwo] ‘large pot’. It is not likely that Tagalog developed an a in the first syllable independently from Malay, and so we consider the Tagalog form to be a Malay borrowing. Forms of Indic and Arabic origin that are cognate in Malay and Tagalog were clearly introduced into Tagalog via Malay. In the case of Arabic forms, there is no evidence for direct contact or contact via any other language except Malay. There are no forms of Arabic origin in Tagalog which are not also attested in Malay. Further, the forms in Tagalog invariably follow any peculiar Malay treatment of the shape and meaning of Arabic loans: e.g., Tagalog sätbat Malay serbat ‘ginger tea’ show a common semantic development from the Arabic original sharbat ‘drink’. The forms of Indic origin have also clearly been camouflaged through Malay. There are very few Philippine forms of Indic provenience which do not have a Malay or at least a Javanese cognate. Some of these Indic borrowings also undergo developments of meaning and shape in Malay that are invariably followed by the Tagalog forms. For example, Malay puasa and Cebuano pu‘döa ‘fast’ show a similar deviation in shape from the Sanskrit upadösa ‘fast’. Similarly, Tagalog bäsö ‘read’ and Malay baca ‘read’ show a parallel semantic development from Sanskrit va ‘speak’. There can be no doubt that Cebuano pu‘döa and Tagalog bäsö both come from Malay puasa and baca, respectively, and not independently from Sanskrit. Similar arguments can be made for
many of the other forms of Indic provenience. That the donating language is indeed Malay rather than Javanese or some other language in Indonesia can be shown in those cases where Tagalog forms of Indic origin show the Malay rather than the Javanese or some other shape. For example, we say that Tagalog *halaga* ‘price, value’ is from Malay *hara* ‘price’ which itself comes from Sanskrit *argha* ‘price’ because it shows the development of initial *h* just as the Malay form does. The Javanese cognate *rêga* ‘price’ does not show this development of initial *h* and therefore cannot be the source of the Tagalog form.

We now turn to the problem of distinguishing borrowings from inherited forms. If we know the etymology of a form, we can, of course, eliminate it from our list of possible inherited forms. Also forms of anomalous shape (of a phonological structure not normal for the protolanguage) can be strongly suspected of being cognate by virtue of borrowing. Further, even if the Tagalog and Malay forms both derive from a form which can be reconstructed in the proto-language and there are cognates in other Austronesian languages, the Tagalog may be considered a borrowing from Malay if the Tagalog and its Malay cognate show a sharp and parallel semantic shift as opposed to the cognates in the other Austronesian languages. Thus Tagalog *salatan* ‘southwest wind’ is a borrowing from Malay *salutan* ‘south’ because the Tagalog and the Malay show a common semantic development as opposed to cognates in other languages which have meanings comparable to Malay *salat* ‘vain’. However, if we do not know the etymology, and if none of the other factors that indicate a borrowing is present, we identify borrowings on the basis of sound correspondences. Forms which are cognate by virtue of inheritance exhibit regular correspondences, as shown in Chart 1. Forms which appear to be cognate but fail to exhibit these regular correspondences must have come into one (or both) of the languages by borrowing, if the forms are cognate at all (with the exception of a few cases of analogical reshaping—see footnote 8); and we have already concluded that such forms must have been Malay forms that came into Tagalog if they are not known to be from

6. For example, there would be no way of recognizing that Malay *salan* and Tagalog *salan* are not related by inheritance if we had no knowledge of the Arabic etymology. Of course, once we know the etymology of a word and the approximate time of borrowing there is no reason to treat the word as an inherited form.

7. For example, we have considered Tagalog *palayok* ‘earthen cooking pot’ to be a borrowing from Malay *pênik* ‘cooking pot’ because the form in the protolanguage which could give rise to this correspondence would be anomalous in shape, *pê* (‘pê’). Also, the correspondence Tagalog *jal* ‘Malay’ is probably an indication of borrowing (see n. 8). Third, the cognates of *karot* and *palayok* in other languages show irregular correspondences: e.g., *ko-lo* *parik* ‘iron’, And finally, the forms Tagalog *kpa* ‘shame’ Kinaray-a *ka-a* ‘shame’ show that it is unlikely that Proto-Austronesian *k* could have become Tagalog *g*.

8. This table follows Demewolf (1934, 1935, and 1938) as revised by Dyen (1931, 1932, and 1933). The symbolism is that proposed by Dyen 1931. We are dealing with probabilities, of course. To determine which set of sound correspondences reflects a sound of the protolanguage and which set is due to secondary developments requires weighing all the available data from related languages. This analysis differs from Demewolf’s and Dyen’s on two points. The correspondence Malay *j* Tagalog *k* which Dyen takes to reflect the reconstructed phoneme *k* we take here to indicate borrowing. *k* is reflected as Tagalog *k* as in Malay *tajam* ‘sharp’ Tagalog *talim* ‘sharp’ (from *tazem*). There is only a handful of forms which show Tagalog *r* where Malay has *j*, and their meaning is very much of the same character as that of forms described here as borrowings; and often they have other hallmarks of being borrowed. E.g., Tagalog *âdi* ‘gaff’ is known to be a borrowing from Malay *nji* because of the final glottal. This confirms our conclusion previously that the *g* correspondence is indicative of borrowing. *Tani* is one of seven examples of terms related to cocks which are borrowings.

Similarly, we consider the handful of forms which show the correspondence Malay *e* Tagalog *a* as borrowings. Demewolf considered these to reflect a protophoneme *e*. Again, the forms which show this correspondence are invariably of the semantic categories of our borrowed words. Further, they appear only in Javanese and the Philippines, not in Oceanic and Formosa, and the vast majority have known etymologies or other phonological signs of being borrowings.

I am now convinced that the correspondence Malay *r* Tagalog *l*, which Demewolf believed to reflect a protophoneme *l*, is actually due to borrowing. Again, there are no good examples of forms showing this correspondence outside of the Philippines and Indonesia, and almost all of them are of a sort likely to be borrowings (Wolf 1934). If the correspondence Malay *r* Tagalog *l* can be shown to reflect borrowings, as I believe it does, we may enlarge our list of Tagalog borrowings from Malay by some 10 to per cent with forms which have no known etymology outside of Austronesian and which show no correspondences other than *r* which mark a borrowing. These forms fit readily into the categories we have established for our borrowings and provide no new substantial information as to the nature of Tagalog-Malay contacts.

Further, borrowing is not the only explanation for irregular correspondences: the probability for an analogical change must also be weighed. Thus, Dyen ascribes the correspondence Malay *final vowel—Tagalog vowel form a final glottal stop to an analogical development (Dyen 1953: Para. 91), whereas I take this correspondence as an indication of borrowing. There is a large number of such examples. A few of them may indeed be inherited, and the Tagalog glottal stop may in those cases be explainable by an analogical development; but the majority of the cases must be borrowings (and they usually have other signs of being borrowings as well).
### Chart 1. Malay, Tagalog, and Javanese reflexes of Proto-Austronesian phonemes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Malay</th>
<th>Tagalog</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>Proto-language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i, e</td>
<td>e*</td>
<td>i, e</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u, o</td>
<td>o*</td>
<td>u, o</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>d, r</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ng</td>
<td>ng (g)</td>
<td>ng (g)</td>
<td>ng (g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ny</td>
<td>ny</td>
<td>ny</td>
<td>ny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>j†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o or w</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>w</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The vowels of the antepenult are all full together in a in Malay and are often reflected as a in Tagalog. Proto-Austronesian a in Tagalog becomes a except in syllables preceding a in which environment it becomes a. The a, r, and s contrasts are recent developments in Malay, Tagalog, and Japanese; and in any given form it is of no moment for our purpose whether a or a occurs, or whether r or s occurs.

† I question Dempwolff's reconstructions of the phonemes d, e, e, r, and s in the Proto-language, but footnote 8.

* The Japanese reflex of the Proto-Austronesian a is [a], not [a], as Dempwolff thought.

Chart 2 summarizes correspondences which we take to be prima facie evidence for borrowing. There is not necessarily any regularity of sound correspondences in borrowed forms: the same Malay sound may at one time be borrowed in one way and at another time in another way.9

8. In fact, we have doubts on Malay borrowings appearing in two shapes, which have persisted to the current time: [klad]; [klad] 'king' from Old Javanese (presumably via Malay) baddha 'king'. That this should be the case is not surprising: languages frequently show variant pronunciations of borrowed forms closer or farther from the pronunciation in the original language. For example, in English the word 'garage' (from French) is pronounced [gærɪdʒ], [gærɪdʒ], [gærɪdʒ], and perhaps other ways as well.

9. Portuguese is itself of Indic provenance, being a borrowing of an Indic form which derives ultimately from Sanskrit nasja 'trade'. Malay minggu 'week, Sunday' is from Portuguese Domingo 'Sunday'. Tagalog linggo 'week, Sunday' shows the same semantic development as the Malay. Further, the change of an initial nasal in a syllable preceding another nasal is attested for other borrowed forms in Tagalog (e.g., tanga 'Malay minggu 'Jackfruit'); thus, the best explanation is that linggo is a borrowing from Malay.

10. Sanskrit forms in Tagalog often show an archaic pronunciation in retaining post-cordial a where no attested Malay has it: Tagalog matsa 'face' Malay maha 'face' Sanskrit maha 'face'; Tagalog kutia 'story' Malay kuta 'story' Sanskrit katha 'speech'; Tagalog pura 'cutting of variegated pieces of cloth' Malay cia 'cotton print' (said to be from modern Indic [Gouda 1973:115]).
that the period of strong Malay influence on Tagalog began at least a century prior to the Spanish conquest. (It could, of course, have begun much earlier.) 12

As regards the part of the Philippines which was under Malay influence, only the language of the Manila area was strongly influenced by Malay. Of the Malay borrowings in Tagalog, only a small portion are found in other languages (outside of Mindanao-Sulu), and these are invariably terms of trade or specific cultural phenomena (words like baba ‘read’ from Malay baca ‘read’). To be sure, we have evidence from Pigafetta that Malay was a language of wider communication in the Visayas, but the Malay influence on the languages of this area is not of the same character or depth as that in Tagalog.

As to the exact locality from which the Malay borrowings into Tagalog come, there are a few clues which point to Borneo. The substitution of a for what is a mid-central vowel ə in most Malay dialects suggests that the Malay dialect was one which shows a for earlier ə. 13 This feature characterizes the Malay dialects of Borneo today and probably was already present in the early sixteenth century. 14 Moreover, many, but not all, Malay dialects underwent a loss of a initially and between unlike vowels, and that change most likely antedates the period of Arabic borrowings (for Arabic borrowings invariably retain a in these positions). Since Tagalog forms borrowed by Malay show retention of a with a handful of exceptions (e.g., Tagalog ʔasta Malay hasta or asta ‘cubit’), the donor dialect must have been an h-preserving dialect. Other clues are dialectal forms, especially in Malay, but confined to certain regions. One

12. Pigafetta (1506-11, 37), writing fifty years before the conquest of Manila, reports that a son of the king of Luzon was the captain-general of the king of Brunei. Thus, we have documentation that Brunei-Manila relations go back this far. Spanish sources describing Legazpi’s conquest of Manila emphasize the shallow penetration of Islam, but they need not be considered reliable on this point. Malay influence on Tagalog is deep and lasted over a period of time, and no doubt Islam had been present in the Manila area for a longer period of time than the Spaniards wanted to believe.

13. Tagalog had (and still has) no mid-central vowel, ə. An earlier mid-central vowel merged with i, a change which was probably already complete by the sixteenth century (as shown by the earliest Tagalog citations). Modern Tagalog substitutes i for a mid-central vowel (e.g., addi ‘table’ from English [stribel]), and certainly mid-central vowels would have been handled the same way at a period much closer in time to the merger of older ə and i.

14. Pigafetta’s word list of Malay shows the same substitution of a for ə. His Cebuano word list indicates a mid-central vowel, which Pigafetta transcribes sometimes ə and sometimes a. Presumably he would have transcribed a Malay mid-central vowel ə in the same way if he had heard one. Because he transcribes Malay forms with a where standard Malay has ə, we may deduce that he got his list in a dialect which shows this substitution of a for ə. Pigafetta’s Malay word list is clear evidence for a type of Brunei Malay. It has at least six forms which nowadays are confined to the Brunei dialect, and the circumstances of the voyage make it likely that he took down the list at or around the time the expedition reached Brunei. Therefore, it is most likely that this substitution of a for ə was a feature of the Brunei Malay of the time.

form, Tagalog binibini ‘lady’, is from a Malay form attested only for Brunei: binibini ‘woman’. There are also many forms of Javanese provenience that even today are used mainly in dialects of Malay influenced by Javanesse, e.g., Tagalog bisa ‘Malay bisa ‘able’. The combination —h-preserving, a for ə, and Javanese-influenced vocabulary —indicates Borneo; but the exact location and final proof can only come when we have better information on Malay dialect geography than at present. 15

Much can be said about the nature of the Malay-Tagalog contact. There are more than 300 Tagalog forms which can be shown conclusively to be of Malay origin (and probably an equal number I have failed to spot), plus a large number which surely are borrowings but do not exhibit any phonological or semantic features that would make them identifiable as borrowings. And probably an even greater number of Malay borrowings has gone out of use in the past four hundred years. Their very number as well as their character indicates that there must have been a considerable population in the Tagalog speech community which could speak Malay. Some of these Malay borrowings are words of an ordinary, everyday character: forms referring to personal characteristics, names and titles of relations, words for parts of the body, and others of the type that refer to things for which there must have been good native terms. Such basic vocabulary can only have come in if members of the Tagalog speech community could speak Malay. For a good portion of these forms we can well imagine the situation that could have led to their adoption into Tagalog. Some of them are clearly forms which ascribed status and came into Tagalog for that reason. Examples of this type are binibini ‘lady behaving in a manner proper to females’ (Noceda’s [1860] definition) from Brunei Malay binibini ‘woman’ as opposed to the native bābdē ‘woman’. (Cf. German Dame ‘lady’ from French as opposed to the native Wein ‘woman’.) Tagalog asta ‘action’ is a borrowing (presumably via Malay) of Javanese asta ‘do’ (said of persons of high rank). We may presume that asta was used as a status form in the Malay that influenced Tagalog and most likely was originally a status form in Tagalog. Many of the polite forms still used in Tagalog are of this sort: Tagalog po ‘sir’, Malay empu ‘master’; Tagalog tābi ‘excuse me’ Malay tabik ‘with your permission’. The presence of these forms in Tagalog indicates clearly that Malay was not learned only as a language of commerce but that it had a certain amount of prestige, probably very much like the function of English
in the Philippines today or French in old Russia. Forms of much the same character are being borrowed from English into the Philippine languages at the present time.

The borrowing of Malay forms which refer to personal characteristics bears out the view that Malay was used in the Manila region as a prestige language. The use of Malay forms to refer to personal characteristics (good or bad) is analogous to the behavior of present-day Filipinos, who often use forms of English or other Philippine languages as a sort of euphemism: making a negative judgment in terms of an allusion to another language in order to blunt the impact, make the statement witty, and keep the speaker in a good light. An example of such a Malay borrowing into Tagalog is lapastangan ‘free-handed, daring to do things one has no right by his station to do’ (Malay lepas ‘free’ and tangan ‘hand’). Or something unpleasant is referred to with a borrowed form to take away the sting, e.g., Tagalog salá ‘error’ Malay salah ‘error’. A good characteristic is referred to by a Malay form to enhance it or give it some special nuance: Tagalog masáti ‘meticulously clean’; Malay suci ‘pure’ (from Sanskrit suci ‘pure’). The parallel between these types of borrowings and current borrowings into Philippine languages from English or other prestige languages is instructive. Cebuano, for example, has borrowed a huge vocabulary of depreciatory words from English and Tagalog. These forms give a nuance of wit or allusion, and with them one makes a joke at the same time that he says something nasty. As a consequence, one can make his point without putting himself in a bad light. For example, one may describe a person who is snobbish or puts on airs as basting ‘boasting’ or biri ‘naughty’ (from English ‘very another’) or dát ‘putting on’ (from the abbreviation o.a. for ‘overacting’). Using these English-derived forms one makes a joke while criticizing and thereby avoids public condemnation as a gossip. Or in current Cebuano one can avoid the harsh realities connoted by a native form through the substitution of the English-borrowed form: for example, a person who has been fired is said to be siginawat (from English ‘get out’) or nagsayin (from English ‘resign’), terms which describe situations that do not seem quite so bad as to suffer the same action denoted by the native form gipahinduá. Or positive characteristics have a special nuance when they are described as ‘having (such-and-such) a characteristic like the Tagalog’, if the borrowing is from Tagalog: for Spaniards, if the borrowing is from Spanish; or Americans, if the borrowing is from English: Cebuano bunitu ‘good-looking like a Spaniard’. Cebuano marúng ‘smart and clever like the Manila people’, and so on. From the modern Cebuano examples we can see how these kinds of Malay forms could have found their way into Tagalog, and further we see that Malay had very much the same sort of social status as English currently has in the Philippines.

There is a handful of forms of high frequency and of the most intimate part of the vocabulary whose existence is difficult to explain: these forms are bási ‘can’, húyu ‘can’, lálo ‘more’, malá ‘beginning’, masú ‘event’, harap ‘facing’, samantála ‘meanwhile’, sakásakáli ‘occasionally’. At least one example of a loan translation occurs in the intimate vocabulary (and perhaps a number of others I have failed to spot). The Malay word meaning ‘new’, baru, has been extended to be used as a conjunction meaning ‘before (doing)’: ako makan baru pergi ‘I ate before I left.’ This sentence can be translated word for word into Tagalog kumain ‘ako ba ging lumakad ‘I ate before I left’, where bága, the Tagalog word for ‘new’, has been extended to mean ‘before’ just like the Malay baru. I do not know of this extension of the meaning of the word for ‘new’ anywhere else in the Philippines; it is clearly a loan translation of the Malay baru.16

For this type of borrowing of basic vocabulary, there are no parallels in borrowings from English. Tagalog does have similar types of borrowings from Spanish, however, and these borrowings may perhaps shed some light on how Malay forms of this kind could find their way into Tagalog. The Spanish forms of a similar nature are forms like púpú ‘can’, perú ‘but’, adjective- and noun-forming affixes, and so on. The Spanish borrowings can be explained by the existence in the Philippines of a group that spoke Spanish (or creoleized Spanish) better than Tagalog and thus spoke a Hispanized Tagalog. Although this segment of the community was always small, it was highly admired, and speech forms associated with it were widely imitated. Nineteenth-century novels provide illustrations of this behavior and serve as documentation for our deductions based on the linguistic evidence. (See also Schuchardt 1883.) The existence in Tagalog of these intimate forms of Malay origin seems to be analogous to the intimate borrowings from Spanish and points (but not conclusively, to be sure) to the existence of a segment of the community which was basically Malay-speaking and whose Tagalog was imitated. There are, however, no borrowings from Malay comparable to the many forms from

16. There is even a minor example of the borrowing of a syntactic construction. The king of Manila is referred to as the raja mañata ong malúng (Malay raja maha young king’), and the king of Tondo is referred to as raja masatulad ng malúng ‘old king’, where masatulad is a form of purely Tagalog origin. (The citation comes from Moro’s Saba as reproduced in Blair and Robertson 1966: XV, 48.) Normally, a phrase consisting of a title followed by another word does not occur in Tagalog, though it is normal Malay. In Tagalog there is a marker ag which must be inserted between the title and the word which follows it. The words which make up the phrase mañata ong malúng are Tagalog, but the way they are put together is Malay.
Spanish which indicate a master-servant relationship, so one cannot go too far in drawing parallels with the mestizo elite of the Philippines.17

The Malay spoken in the Manila area developed its own character just as Spanish and English in the Philippines have done.18 Numerous forms, clearly of Malay origin, are used in combinations and meanings not attested for modern Malay such as dalambhit ‘extreme sorrow’ (from Malay dalam ‘within’ and hati ‘liver [as the seat of the emotions]’), other forms containing bati ‘rapist’, lapastangan ‘daring, too free-handed’ (from Malay lipas ‘to touch quickly’ and tangkas ‘hand’), and the like. Also there are Malay-Tagalog combinations, like bahaghi2 ‘rainbow’ (Tagalog bahag ‘G-string’ and Malay hari ‘day’). Many of the Malay borrowings have drifted considerably from the original Malay meaning, and these semantic shifts in many cases may well have characterized the Malay spoken in Manila.

Many of the borrowed forms suggest the spheres in which Malay was used. Some refer to intellectual activities (sasat ‘investigate’, hakum ‘judge’), some to geographical and nautical items (lal ‘sea’, dalutan ‘land as opposed to sea’, solihan ‘southwest’), some to measurements, commercial activities, amusements. A good portion of the Malay borrowings into Tagalog refer to elements of civilization which were introduced to the Tagalog speakers: articles and devices (utensils, items of dress and ornament, foods and drinks, items of house construction, weapons, and so on), social institutions, medicine, religion. For a handful of terms there is no explanation. We have omitted from this study terms referring to flora and fauna which are not domesticated or which are not of some religious or commercial significance because the terms for flora and fauna common to Malay and Tagalog are widespread throughout the Philippines and Indonesia, and their spread into Tagalog has been under a different sort of impact than the other terms described here; they offer no evidence as to the nature of the contact between the Malay and the Tagalog speech communities.19

17. Most of the Philippine languages influenced by Spanish are full of Spanish-derived commands, terms of reference and address to a master or mistress, and the like: e.g., Cebuano anda ‘get going’, libahan ‘beve’, yun ‘term of address to a master’, bati ‘bait’, misdina ‘servant’, and the like. These Spanish-derived forms all give an impression of a world in which the supervisors were Spanish-speaking and the servants speakers of a Philippine language (and, of course, we have plentiful documentation that this situation did indeed obtain). We have nothing from Malay into Tagalog of a similar character.

18. The Cebuano borrowings from English kis ‘lend’ ‘haughty’ (from very ‘another’) or prasa ‘fire’ from a job (from get out) show how sharp the semantic shift may be in borrowed forms.

19. An example is the name of the fish called in Malay karan takt ‘the malehead of the sea’. This name recurs in scores of languages throughout Indonesia and the Philippines. It also occurs in Cebuano as kalan takt, and the fishes that refered to are approximately the same ones covered by the name karan takt in Malay. We know that the Cebuano form must be a borrowing because there is a form takt ‘in Cebuano, but its meaning has drifted considerably from the original meaning of ‘sea’. Moreover, the structure of the phrase is not normal for Cebuano; there should be a marker between the two nouns. Thus the form kalan takt must have come into Cebuano by borrowing. For the same species of fishes there are at least five other names in Cebuano. This example shows how readily susceptible terms for flora and fauna are to replacement by newly borrowed forms. Terms of this sort travel faster and farther than others in a language and do not provide information on the nature of contacts between speech communities.

20. We use the following abbreviations: AI, Arabic; Jaw, Jawanese; Ojg, Old Jawanese; Mt, Malay; PAN, Proto-Austronesian; Skt, Sanskrit; Tag, Tagalog. For Tagalog we give Pangalan’s (1973) gloss if the form is found there; if not, we give Serrano Lakaw’s (1941), and if the form is only in Noceda (1961), we follow Noceda’s gloss. Also in cases where the definition given by Serrano Lakaw or Noceda is more directly comparable to the meaning of the Malay form than Pangalan’s, we follow Serrano Lakaw or Noceda. For Malay we quote Wilkinson’s gloss (1932), and in the few cases where a form is not found in Wilkinson, we follow Iskandar (1979). Since the Malay glosses are in many cases based on the current meaning, we should not be surprised to find forms where the Tagalog borrowing is considerably more conservative in retaining earlier meanings than the Malay form we quote.

We now give a list of the forms on which our conclusions are based. An asterisk before the abbreviation Tag indicates that a cognate of the form occurs also in Cebuano. Since Cebuano is located farther away from Tagalog than most of the other languages outside of the Mindanao-Sulu area, we can get some idea of the extent to which Malay borrowings have spread beyond Manila and the character of the forms which did spread. In a few cases we quote forms from other Philippine languages when no Tagalog cognate is attested. The presumption is that these forms came from Tagalog into the other languages and subsequently disappeared in Tagalog.20

1. Forms referring to character traits and personal feelings: Tag dalubha ‘irresponsible, squanderer’ Ojg paribhoga ‘enjoyment’ Skt paribhoga ‘enjoyment’; *Tag dida ‘hope’, Mt dida ‘hope’ Skt dha ‘hope’; *Tag baliya ‘restless, fidgety’ Mt belisah ‘restless, fidgety’; *Tag bangis ‘curious, fickle’ Mt bingis ‘curious, indifferent to the suffering of others’; Tag bami (accentuation unknown) ‘persuade with deceptive arguments’ Ojg bami (meaning unknown) Skt vini ‘eloquent speech’; *Tag budha ‘will, intention, conscience’ Mt budhi ‘quality of mind and heart’ Skt buddhi ‘intelligence, reason’; Tag bunya ‘distinction, fame, glory’ Mt buni ‘dull’; Tag daya ‘deceit’ Mt daya ‘artifice, dodge’; Tag duka ‘poor, unfortunate’ Mt duka ‘grief’ Skt dukha ‘uneasiness, pain, sorrow’; Tag dudubha (accentuation unknown) ‘twist someone’s words’ Mt duraha ‘reason, insubordination’ Skt durbaha (Gonda 1937:115) ‘injury, laying violent hands upon’; Tag dugu ‘stupid’ Mt duno ‘obstinate stupid, dull-witted’; Tag dusta ‘treated with outrage, ignominiously’ Mt dusta ‘lying, falsehood’ Skt dula ‘false, inimical, offensive’; Tag dulot ‘speed, frequency’ Mt daras ‘rapidity’; Tag dalita ‘misery, suffering, poverty’ Mt darta ‘endure’ Skt dhat ‘bore’; Tag dusa ‘suffering, punishment’ Mt dusa ‘sin’ Skt dosha ‘fault, transgression’.
opposite directions' Mi sēlisih 'varying, not coinciding'; Tag sāma 'go together with' Mi sama 'together'; Sōma sama 'same, like'; Tag sivha 'correct a fault' Java sāda 'really happen, go through'; Sōma siddha 'accomplished, perfect'; Tag suvato 'in harmony' Mi suvato 'one'; Tag tapat 'directly in front of' Mi tēpat 'exactly, precisely'; Tag tulad 'like, similar' Mi tādān 'towards, toward'.

3. Forms referring to a group or crowd: Tag pungkat 'section, group, portion' Mi pungkat 'tier, shape, rank' (a re-formation of the root angkat 'lift'); Tag salamsha 'mob, mingle with' Mi sēnā 'all together' Sōma sēnā 'assemblage'; Tag samaya 'accompany' (no Java or Mi) Sōma sēnā 'compact, agreement'.

4. Terms referring to sensations: Tag dīra 'feeling of loathing for what is foul or filthy' Mi Ji jī or jījē 'feeling of disgust'; Tag tōsa Mi sāsā sōsa 'taste, sensation'; Tag pāla 'grace, blessing' Mi pahāla 'reward, grant'; Sōma phāla 'fruit, benefit'; Tag pāri 'favor' Mi pūjā 'praise' Sōma pūjā 'honour, worship'; Tag sarap Mi sidāp 'delicious'; Tag pagā-lamāsā 'enjoyment of abundance' Mi ēmēma 'enthusiasm, show' (said to be from Persian).

5. Forms referring to ability: Tag behaya 'it is just barely good, powerful, etc., enough to do' Mi bahagia 'good fortune' Sōma bhāga 'luck, good fortune'; Tag bāsā 'skilled, experienced accustomed' Mi bāsā 'habitual'; Sōma bhāsika 'habit, custom'; Tag maka-bīsa 'can' bīsa 'effect'; Mi bīsa 'can' Sōma visā 'poison, active ingredient'; Tag gunagunahin 'enjoy something while one has the chance' Mi guṇa 'magical potency, use' Sōma guṇa 'quality'; Tag kawasā 'endurance, tolerance' Mi kawasa 'power over'; Tag kāya 'ability, can do, wealthy' Mi kāya 'having power, wealth'; Tag paham 'sage, erudite' Mi paham 'understand' Ar paham 'understand'; Tag lakas 'strength' Mi lakās 'fast'; Tag pantas 'nimble, acquitting oneself well' Mi pantās 'neat, nimble, graceful'.

6. Forms of politeness or which give status; euphemisms: Tag rasta 'posture, attitude of the body, action' Java asta 'have, hold, do' (honorable form) Sōma hasta 'hand, holding in hand'; Hilīgaynon butō 'haut' Sōma bōtō 'buttocks' Mi bōtō 'buttocks'; Tag tinībīna 'lady behaving properly and modestly' Malay tinībinī 'woman'; Tag dalīrī 'finger, toe' Mi jērī 'finger'; Tag gara 'stateliness, pomposity' Miガラ 'of royal birth on both sides'; Tag gaura 'do' Mi pēŋgōna 'dignitary'; Tag kalīna 'conceit' Mi karnara, karunia 'bounty, favor' Sōma kāryō 'pity'; Tag mukha 'face' Sōma mukha 'face'; Tag param 'disappear' Mi padam 'extinguish' Javā pōām 'honorable form referring to someone dead'; Tag sīra 'defective' Mi sidāna 'defect, flaw' Sōma sidāna 'fault, defect'; Tag sīla (accentuation unknown) 'leave something up to someone' Mi sīla 'please, you are invited to do' Sōma sīla 'custom, practice, good disposition'; Tag sīla 'sit on floor with legs
crossed in front of one' Mi bër-sitâ 'sit squatting on floor'; *Tag tâbi 'respectful request to be excused or pass in front of someone' Tag pasintâbi 'ask to be excused' Mi takb 'with your permission' Skt kshantiyava 'expression asking pardon'; *Tag salamat 'thank you' Mi sêlam 'word of greeting' Ar salam 'safe and sound'; Tag wapasa 'flatter, perfidious' Mi upaca 'ceremony, honor' Skt upâcara 'polite or obliging behavior'; Tag kisap 'converse' Mi wap 'speaking'.

6a. Titles, terms of address and relationship, names: Tag bunsu 'youngest son or brother' Mi bunsu 'youngest born'; *Tag bansa 'nation' Mi bansa 'race' Skt varsa 'lineage, race'; Tag kaka 'title for elder sibling or first cousin' Tag kaka 'title for aunt or uncle' Mi kak 'title for elder brother or sister'; *Tag dôto 'chief' Mi dota, dottak 'chief'; *Tag hari, haidi 'king' Qaj haji 'prince'; Tag lasâ 'title of nobility' Mi raja 'king' Skt raja 'king'; Tag Laksamana 'person's name' Mi Laksamana 'name of Rama's half-brother' (from Skt); *Tag maharikâ 'noble' Mi mårâhika 'freedom' Skt maharâhika 'very prosperous, powerful' Tag po 'respectful term of address' Mi emp 'master'.

7. Forms referring to intellectual activities: Tag alipustâ 'determine something for oneself' Qaj variştî 'examined' Skt varisthitam 'examined'; Tag alûshîtâ 'verification, proof' Qaj alûcita 'proven' Skt alûcita 'considered'; *Tag alam 'known' Mi pêng-alam-an 'experience' Ar alâm 'known'; Tag alamat 'legend, tradition' Mi alamat 'sign, portent of the future' Ar alâmät 'marks, signs'; Tag dâr 'instruction, advice' Tag pag 'study' Mi ajar 'instructed' bîlajâr 'study'; Tag dâral 'custom, habit' Mi asal 'source' Ar aš 'basis'; Tag alâda 'idea' Mi akal 'idea' Ar 'açala have intelligence'; *Tag basa Mi baca 'read' Skt vas 'speak, recite'; Akkûn bûsâ 'word' Mi bicara 'speak' Skt vicāra 'discourse'; Tag dalûhabhâ 'expert' Mi jurabhâsâ 'translator'; *Tag dîva 'sense, consciousness, spirit' Mi jiva 'life, soul' Skt jiva 'principle of life'; Tag guru 'Skt guru 'preceptor'; Tag harâya 'imagination' Qaj harâya 'mind'; Tag hikyât 'sweet talk' Mi hikyät 'narrative, story' Ar hikâyât 'stories'; Tag 'ingat 'care, devotion' Mi ingat 'give attention' Jav ingeti 'remember'; Tag kalâtas 'letter' Mi kertas 'paper' Ar girâ 'paper'; Tag katha 'literary composition' Mi katha 'speech' Skt kathâ 'conversation, speech'; *Tag kawun 'clerk' Mi kérân 'clerk'; Tag kawi (accentuation unknown) 'gibberish' Mi kawi 'poetic speech' Skt kavi 'sage, poet'; Tag mantâla 'sacred text, charm' Mi mantrâ 'magical formula, incantation' Skt mantra 'sacred text'; Tag palithâsâ 'sarcaslic, ironical' Mi ðîbâhâsâ 'proverb'; Tag palikâ 'proof, essay' MI pûriksam 'examined' Skt pûrâsa.

22. The Samar-Levy cognate of this word is mastra. Since SL has an ɿ as well as an ɭ phoneme, one would not expect an r in this form if it is cognate with the Malay and Arabic forms. Perhaps there is no connection between Tag ulam and MI pêngalaman.

Malay Borrowings in Tagalog

'inspect'; *Tag panday Mi pandai 'smith' Skt pândya 'wise, learned'; Tag salita 'tell' Mi cêrita 'story, tell' Skt cerita 'deeds, adventures'; Tag sampalataya 'believe' Mi percha 'believe' Skt samparyaya 'faith, belief'; Tag sapatat 'plot, intrigue' Mi sipat 'agreement' Ar muwafiqat 'agreement'; *Tag saksi Mi saksi Skt saksî 'witness'; Tag sipsat 'suspect' Mi sipsat 'investigate' Ar sîbat 'management'; Tag suri 'ascertain' Tag súri 'analyze' MI sudi 'purity, correctness' Skt sùddha 'purity, justification, verification'; Cebuano súliya 'criticize, point out a person's mistakes to him' Qaj codya 'provoking criticism' Skt codya (Gonda 1973:143) 'be incited, criticized'; *Tag pagka-tahô 'realization, comprehension' MI tahù 'know'; Tag tanto 'realized' MI têntu 'sure'.

8. Forms referring to supernatural beings or to religious, magical, or medical matters: Tag lagimat 'amulet' MI azimât, ajimat 'amulet' Ar 'azimâ 'incantation, spell'; Tag bakam 'scraping glass' MI bér-lékan 'cup'; Tag balâsa 'vow' MI bérâla 'idol' Skt vrâla 'sacrament vow, holy practice'; Cebuano bârang 'king of special insects used in witchcraft or the witchcraft using these insects'; MI bâjang 'kind of supernatural animal at the service of its owner'; *Tag bairhâla 'god' MI bêra 'title of divinity' Skt bhûjara 'noble lord'; *Tag diudia 'nymph goddess' MI divâla 'god' Skt devâ 'godhead, divinity'; *Tag kapri 'kind of supernatural being in the form of a large black man' MI kapri 'negro' Ar kûfir 'unbeliever'; Tag kabal 'something used to render oneself invulnerable' MI kîbal 'invulnerable'; *Tag ngâyin 'pray' MI mengâi 'study, recite the Koran'; Tag linga (lingga) 'kind of idol' Qaj lingga 'image' Skt lingâ 'Shiva's emblem'; Tag lêkha 'statute' Qaj rëka 'image of a god' Skt râkha, lekha 'streak, line, drawing'; Tag mentàla 'sacred text, charm' MI mûntrâ 'magical formula, incantation' Skt mantra 'sacred text'; Tag nega 'figure put on the prow of a boat' MI naga 'kind of snake' MI ragna 'image carved on the prow of a boat' Skt nágâ 'serpent demon'; Cebuano puâsa 'fast' MI puâsa 'fast' Skt upâsâ 'fast'; *Tag pati 'nak 'supernatural being that kills newborn babies' MI pûnâjan (from pûnâjan) 'supernatural being that kills children'; *Tag pûntak 'interruption, patron' MI puña 'ask for' kiñch 'love'; Tag pag-sambak 'worship, adoration' MI ēmbah 'obeisance'; Tag tanâ 'sign, mark' MI tanda 'sign, token'; Tag batas 'law, decree' MI batas 'boundary' Jav wâti 'boundary'; *Tag hukom 'pass judgement' MI hukom 'decrees, law' Ar hukum 'pass judgement'.

9. Forms referring to business, finance, and measurements: Tag 'asta 'cubit' MI hasta, asta 'cubit' Skt hasta 'measure, the length of the forearm'; Tag 'sem 'grain of gold' (Noceda 1860:one-sixteenth of a gold tahîl);

12. Terms referring to goods and devices.


23. Tag barawar is recognizable as a borrowing on the basis of its r: see n. 8.) However, I do not know an etymology. In other languages in which cognates occur the shape indicates borrowing, e.g. Mongondow baladu Gorontalo babalu. Further, it is a trisyllabic root; therefore the chances are infinitesimally small that these forms are not related by borrowing from MI, even though a MI cognate is not attested.
sword'. *Tag calamaya' 'chain'; MI talikala 'binding for the stomach of a woman in labor'. Skt śrīkāla, śrīkāla 'chain, fetter'; Tag tēkak 'kite, dagger'; MI tajak 'grass cutter.'

12c. Terms referring to warfare: *Tag alagak 'care, vigilance' Tag baga (accentuation unknown) 'be awake'; MI jaga 'be vigilant'; Prakrit jaggai 'be vigilant'; *Tag bangga 'collision, battle'; Jav bangga 'recalcitrant, opposed'. Skt bhanga 'breaking, overthrow, refutation'; Tag halabila 'noisy crowd of confused mixture' MI huru biru 'commotion, uproar'; *Tag kawal 'soldier'; MI kawal 'watchman'; Tamil kōvai 'guard'; *Tag kāla 'fortress'; Skt kāla 'house'; Tag pūksa 'exterminated'; Jav maksa 'disappear, sink away'; Skt makṣa 'enunciation.'

12d. Terms for devices for storing, serving, or preparing foods: Tag balanga' MI balānga 'wide-mouthed earthen cooking jar'; Tag gari 'large china vase' MI gari 'water vessel'; Tag kalon 'stove for cooking' MI kōran 'chafing dish'; Tag kawā 'large cauldron' MI kawā 'vat, cauldron'; Mandarin kāi *Tag kawā 'rounded frying pan' MI kōli 'wide-mouthed cooking pot'; Tag kumbu 'decanter, eruet' MI kumbu 'fish basket of wicker work shaped like a water vessel'; Tag paso 'earthen vessel, flower pot' MI paso 'deep bowl, flower pot'; *Tag pīnggā 'plate' MI pīnggā 'plate'; Tamil pīngkān 'chinaware'; Cebuano panay 'shallow earthenware basin'; Jav pān' basin, bowl'; Tamil pānāi 'big jar'; *Tag sandok 'ladle, scoop'; MI sandōk 'spoon, ladle'; Tag sūro *Tag sudō jau 'spoon'; Cebuano tāyay 'tāyay' MI tajīw 'large, narrow-mouthed earthenware pot'; *Tag tūngko 'cooking place of three stones or edges to hold a pot' MI tūngko 'hearthstones for supporting pot over a fire.'

12c. Terms for musical devices: *Tag bangga' 'bamboo flute' MI banggi 'kind of flageolet'; Skt varnā 'kind of flute'; Tag bidya 'chord stop, fret' (no Jav or MI cognate found) Skt svarga 'kind of musical instrument'; *Tag kudōpa 'lyre, harp' MI kōcepi 'kind of four-stringed lute'; Skt kacāp (Gonda 1973: 125) 'kind of lute.'

12f. Terms referring to constructions or devices for construction: Tag gušā 'large building' OJav gosali 'smithy'; Skt gosāla 'cow stall'; Tag lagāi 'saw' MI gūjajī 'saw' Skt kraṣaka 'saw'; Cebuano kawat 'rafter'; MI kawat 'rafter'; Tag katon 'plane' MI kālam 'grip firmly'; Tag kawat Cebuano kāwata 'wire'; MI kawat 'wire'; Tag kūn 'lock' MI kūni 'key'; Cebuano lansang 'nail' MI lāncang 'stake'; Tag pako 'nail' MI paku 'nail'; Tag pāsak 'dowel'; MI pāsak 'fastening or tightening with a twist, peg, or wedge'; Jav pasé 'pressed tight'; Tag pinto 'door' MI pintu 'door'; *Tag sulamba.'

25. Tag halabila is considered to be a borrowing of MI huru biru because the formation huru biru is of a type not present in Tag and further Tag kōla 'mixed' is itself a borrowing of hura 'confused, disorderly.'
REFERENCES


